

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2020.5.9

UDC 323.173

ETHNIC SEPARATISM, ITS PLACE AND ROLE IN POLITICAL PROCESSESORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7739-7232>**Khevturiani Amiran, Doctor of International Relations, Professor of Georgian Technical University (Georgia)**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6889-4771>**Kveselava Igor, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of Georgian Technical University, President of the Academy of Social Sciences (Georgia)**

One of the most actualized ethnopolitical problems of our time is the growth in the number of separatist movements in different parts of the world. This phenomenon developed and gained strength in the second half of the 20th century simultaneously with the anti-colonial and national liberation movements. Moreover, it is worth noting that movements that set as their main goal the separation of a certain part of a multinational state and the creation of an independent national-state entity in this territory, have intensified not only in third world countries, where the colonial legacy left a significant number of disputed borders, but and in the oldest Western democracies. The course of the processes of ethnic separatism in multi-ethnic states largely depends on the degree of development of democratic institutions and values in society. Depending on this factor, the movement for secession from a single state may take the form of a constitutional process and public dialogue, or an intra-state conflict (or even war, depending on the scale of the violence). Briefly summarizing the above, it is necessary to highlight the following. Ethnic separatism means a movement whose main goal is to secede an ethnic region from a multinational state and create its own state formation or join another state. Thus, the concept of ethnic separatism does not include such phenomena as the disintegration of the state or its regionalization (so-called economic separatism), which act as independent processes not directly interdependent on the phenomenon of ethnic separatism. Ethnic separatism, as a phenomenon, to one degree or another inherent in all multinational states, has a serious impact not only on intrastate group relations, but also on international politics, which makes it possible to characterize it as a challenge to the world order that emerged after the end of the Cold War.

Keywords: separatism; globalization; national liberation movement; secession; ethno-territorial conflict;

Хевтуріані А., Квеселова І. Етнічний сепаратизм, його місце та роль в політичних процесах

Однією з найбільш актуальних етнополітичних проблем сучасності є зростання кількості сепаратистських рухів у різних частинах світу. Це явище розвивалось і набирало сили у другій половині ХХ століття одночасно з антиколоніальним та національно-визвольним рухом. Більше того, варто зазначити, що рухи, що ставлять своєю головною метою відокремлення певної частини багатонаціональної держави та створення незалежного національно-державного утворення на цій території, посилились не лише в країнах третього світу, де колоніальна спадщина залишила значну кількість спірних кордонів, але і в найстаріших західних демократіях. Хід процесів етнічного сепаратизму в багатоетнічних державах значною мірою залежить від ступеня розвитку демократичних інститутів та цінностей у суспільстві. Залежно від цього чинника, рух за відокремлення від однієї держави може мати форму конституційного процесу та публічного діалогу, або внутрішньодержавного конфлікту (або навіть війни, залежно від масштабу насильства). Коротко підсумовуючи вищезазначене, необхідно відзначити наступне: етнічний сепаратизм означає рух, основною метою якого є відокремлення етнічного регіону від багатонаціональної держави та створення власного державного утворення або приєднання до іншої держави. Таким чином, поняття етнічного сепаратизму не включає такі явища, як дезінтеграція держави або її регіоналізація (так званий економічний сепаратизм), які виступають як самостійні процеси, які безпосередньо не залежать від явища етнічного сепаратизму. Етнічний сепаратизм, як явище, в тій чи іншій мірі властиве всім багатонаціональним державам, має серйозний вплив не тільки на внутрішньодержавні відносини між групами, але і на міжнародну політику, що дозволяє охарактеризувати це як виклик світовому порядку, що виник після закінчення холодної війни.

Ключові слова: сепаратизм; глобалізація; національно-визвольний рух; сецесія; етнотериторіальний конфлікт

The concept of ethnic separatism includes exclusively a movement, the purpose of which is the exit of an ethnic region from a multinational state in order to create its own national state formation or to join another state. One of the most important prerequisites for the deepening of the ethnopolitical conflict based on the demand for

secession is the formation of an identity conflict, which is one of the main obstacles in the search for ways to resolve such problems. This factor also significantly increases the scale of violence and the brutality of the parties in the conflict, which leads to an increase in the number of victims among the population.

The course of the processes of ethnic separatism in multi-ethnic states largely depends on the degree of development of democratic institutions and values in society. Depending on this factor, the movement for secession from a single state may take the form of a constitutional process and public dialogue, or an intra-state conflict (or even war, depending on the scale of the violence).

External military intervention in an ethno-political conflict based on the demands of an ethnic group to secede from a multinational state at the current historical stage is a negative factor in the settlement of such conflicts due to the fact that it is unable to influence the causes of the conflict. External intervention introduces into the conflict, in addition to the acting parties, an additional active agent who pursues his interests in a given conflict situation and is not always interested in a quick settlement of the conflict.

The policy of ethnic preferences can play a significant role in reducing the severity of the problem of ethnic separatism in the world, ensuring a flexible response of the state authorities to the problems of ethnic groups. Variations of such a policy should be created only on the basis of the local context and the experience of the relationship between a particular state and its ethnic groups. The perception of preferential policies directly depends on the prevailing culture of conflict in society.

To prevent or resolve conflicts on the basis of ethnic separatism, the development of an appropriate education system for the population of potentially separatist regions is of particular importance. The priority should be the formation of personal attitudes that correspond to civil society with a gradual decrease in the role of ethnic identification in everyday life, which is ensured by a balanced combination of the civil and ethnocultural components in the educational policy of a multinational state.

As for the definition of separatism as a phenomenon, a social process, there is no complete unity on this issue among researchers. However, it should be noted that different researchers often mean different phenomena under the concept of "separatism". In this case, the question is: should the terms "separatism" and "secession" be attributed to movements that set their main (and often the only) goal of leaving the ethno-federal system and creating their own national state formation, or can the scope of their application be expanded at the expense of those movements that claim to expand territorial autonomy, obtain a special status within the framework of a single state, strengthen their control over the occupied territory? According to a number of Western researchers, the term "separatism" can be interpreted quite broadly and can include those ethnic movements that put forward demands for a broader regional autonomy within a single state [11; 15]. According to this point of view, separatists demanding complete separation and the creation of their own national state, they are simply in worse conditions in their ethno-federal system compared to other separatist groups in other states. As examples, the famous American researcher D. Horowitz cites the difference in the position and demands of the Basques and Catalans in Spain in the last century, emphasizing that the radical demands of the Basque separatists are largely due to the brutal repressions that were carried out against them during the reign of General Franco [11, p. 231].

In addition to the above, there is a significant problem in defining the main approaches to explain the rise of separatism in the XX century. Most of the explanations for this phenomenon are somehow connected with nationalism. Firstly, it is about whether each ethnic group should have its own state. In the case of a positive answer to this question, in such situations the rise of nationalism and national self-awareness will inevitably cause separatist sentiments if this group is part of the ethno-federal system. J. Kellas, briefly summarizing the main aspects of the theories of nationalism by K. Deutsch, M. Hechter, E. Gellner, E. Smith, concluded that based on these views, the rise of nationalism (and with it separatist sentiments) is a kind of reaction to modernization [12, p. 39-49]. This phenomenon, according to the American researcher, is expressed in a reaction to the growth of inequality between the center and the periphery, cultural, economic and political differences that appear between them. It is also a reaction to the process of industrialization and the growing role of the state in promoting this process, and in addition, "the decline of religion, the strengthening of the centralized state and the bureaucratic system, as well as the growing pressure of the industrial economy."

A different approach to the problem is based on the point of view according to which the weakening of the state leads to the growth of separatist sentiments. P. Hirst and G. Thompson argue that with "the decline of central government national minorities and regions can defend their autonomy with less fear ...". Sometimes the weakening of the state is associated with the process of globalization. So, for example, R. Börbach expressed the idea that on the periphery "governments are significantly weakened due to the fact that international capital imposes its own conditions on them" [6, p. 19]. Thus, according to this point of view, until the state has sufficient strength, this circumstance will restrain nationalist and separatist movements.

Some researchers directly put forward the thesis that globalization has a more direct impact on separatism than only through weakening the state. For example, E. Cvetkovic and D. Kellner argue that "there has been a significant rise in subcultures of resistance that try to preserve specific forms of culture and society as opposed to globalization and homogenization", which, in turn, are supported by central governments [8, p. 9]. These authors do not insist on the fact that globalization was the only reason for such a powerful rise in the separatist movement in the world, although we are sure that it played an important role here.

The fall of the authoritarian regimes in Eastern Europe and, above all, the collapse of the USSR are often cited as the reasons that catalyzed separatism. As Y. Bugaysky notes, with the collapse of the USSR and the collapse of the communist system in Eastern Europe, "a wide opportunity has opened up for the revival of ethnic consciousness and the revival of movements for national self-determination." [8, p. 9]. The end of authoritarian one-party rule in a number of African states is also often attributed to the causes of interethnic conflicts and separatist movements on the continent.

Simultaneously with the cessation of the existence of the socialist states, as some researchers believe, there was a feeling of the loss of ideology, which for many years bound society with common goals and objectives. K. Young specifically noted the importance of such a "legitimizing doctrine" for maintaining the integrity of the ethno-federal system. This moment, noted in various countries, is also put forward as one of the reasons for the rise of separatism.

Also, among these reasons, the policy of a single state, aimed at cultural assimilation of non-titular ethnic groups, is often mentioned. D. Brown, for example, noted that the increase in the number of cases of ethnic separatism among ethnic minorities is due to the assimilationist policy of the state [3, p. 3].

Ethnic separatism is essentially an ethno-territorial conflict, which is based on the desire of an ethnic group to stand out from the common state, perceived by its representatives as a state formation of another ethnic group. Usually separatism is divided into three main categories: 1) secession, which implies secession from a single state and the creation of its own independent national state; 2) irredentism - separation from one state in order to join another; 3) enosis - separation from the state for the purpose of joining a state with a single ethnic population. It is worth considering the fact that the most frequent case of separatism is secession, the other two options are extremely rare and are in addition to the first.

In addition, as mentioned above, there is no unified approach to whether to consider movements in ethno regions that demand the expansion of autonomy within a single state to be separatism, and whether the disintegration of colonial empires, as well as states such as the USSR and Yugoslavia. As for the first provision, here the term "separatism" is inappropriate, since it does not reflect the essence of the phenomenon. Decentralization of the country to one degree or another does not necessarily lead to manifestations of separatism and the separation of any ethno-territories. Problems with civil integration of certain regions arise in many countries, but demands for secession are not heard everywhere. Here, in our opinion, the categories of decentralization or (in some cases) regionalization in domestic relations would be more appropriate, which in essence does not lead to the disintegration of a single state, economic and legal space.

Also here it is necessary to distinguish between separatism as the separation of one territory from a single state and the disintegration of a state, when practically all parts of the former single space become independent states. The disintegration of a state may well begin with the demands of one or a number of ethnic groups for secession; nevertheless, the satisfaction of these demands in one way or another does not lead directly to the complete disintegration of a single state. A striking example of this is the history of the collapse of the USSR, which began with the demands of the Baltic republics to secede from the Union. If a new union treaty was signed, to which 9 out of 15 union republics had agreed by August 1991, a single state would have been preserved in a transformed form; the republics that did not sign the treaty would actually have committed secession by doing so. As a result, after the failed speech of the State Emergency Committee, the union agreement was not signed by any of the republics, which led to the collapse of the union state as such.

A similar example is demonstrated by the history of the collapse of the Yugoslav Federation. The only exception in this case is the position of the international community, the most active representatives of which, as well as a number of international organizations, immediately began to take a very active part in the process of the disintegration of the ethno-federal system of Yugoslavia. A special conference on the peaceful settlement of the conflict was convened, the participants which turned to the International Arbitration Court with a request to determine the legality of the separation of parts of the union republics from a single state. The court identified Yugoslavia as a federation in the process of disintegration. By virtue of this definition, the court concluded that new states can be formed within the former republican borders, but not any others.

Here we come to another important problem related to the analysis of ethnic separatism, namely, the role of the international community and the problem of external interference in the internal ethnopolitical and ethno-territorial conflict. Many researchers note that it was international intervention that led to the collapse of the Yugoslav ethno-federal system through one of the most brutal and bloody civil wars in the 20th century. Of course, we do not share this point of view, since the system was completely degraded. On the other hand, the central government of Yugoslavia from the very beginning chose the path of violence to preserve its territorial integrity, which led to the final collapse of the system.

In addition, among the problems arising as a result of the intensification of the separatist movement, it is necessary to single out the so-called mutual separatism, which makes it extremely difficult to resolve the conflict. In other words, separatism in one region can lead to the emergence of secessionist movements in other parts of the country. Among other things, in a situation where we can observe sequentially emerging foci of separatism (or threats of their emergence), the task of the central government on the way to search for a possible solution to the situation while maintaining the general status quo becomes much more complicated. Attempts by the authorities, by fulfilling part of the requirements of the national elite and the population of a potentially separatist region or by providing them with certain advantages, to preserve this or that territory as part of the federation often meet with harsh rejection from

other subjects. A convincing example of this statement is the situation that developed in late 1991 - early 1992 in Georgia. When the Abkhaz separatists began a separatist movement, demanding separation from Georgia, then the Ossetian separatists also followed them. However, it should be noted that the movement of Abkhaz and Ossetian separatists in Georgia began during the Soviet era. Then the Abkhaz separatists demanded separation from the Georgian SSR and obtaining the status of a separate union republic within the USSR. While in the case of the Ossetian separatists, the situation was different, they demanded the secession from the Georgian SSR and entry into the Autonomous Republic of North Ossetia, which in turn was part of the RSFSR. They did not achieve their goal until the collapse of the USSR, but after Georgia declared independence and became a sovereign state, Abkhazian and Ossetian separatists were able to achieve their goal with the support and direct assistance of the Kremlin.

As noted above, one of the main issues in connection with the secession is the problem of ethnic minorities in the hotel areas. In this regard, it is appropriate to cite the opinion of D. Horowitz, who considers the general rule of separatist movements that "... groups enjoying the right to self-determination form states with ethnic characteristics that exclude minorities. The main focus is on the origin". It should be added that, moreover, sometimes ethnic groups that have separated either as a result of secession or during the disintegration of the federation try to make the territory of their national state ethnically pure, free from the presence of national minorities. An example of this is persistent striving. Abkhazian authorities, when they and their subordinates of gangs forced 250,000 ethnic Georgians to leave Abkhazia.

It is worth noting that for a state that has separatist movements on its territory, the decision to "divorce" is extremely difficult. In any case, the state will resist the secession of any part of it, fearing the "domino" effect that may follow after the precedent of a successful secession. Briefly summarizing the above, it is necessary to highlight the following. Ethnic separatism means a movement whose main goal is to secede an ethnic region from a multinational state and create its own state formation or join another state. Thus, the concept of ethnic separatism does not include such phenomena as the disintegration of the state or its regionalization (so-called economic separatism), which act as independent processes not directly interdependent on the phenomenon of ethnic separatism. Ethnic separatism, as a phenomenon, to one degree or another inherent in all multinational states, has a serious impact not only on intrastate group relations, but also on international politics, which makes it possible to characterize it as a challenge to the world order that emerged after the end of the Cold War.

References:

1. Bates R. Ethnic Competition and Modernization in Contemporary Africa Comparative Political Studies. 1974. – Vol.6. #4. – P. 156-189.
2. Brown C, Boswell T. Ethnic conflict and political violence: A cross-national analysis // Journal of political and military sociology. 1997. – Vol. 25. – # 1. – P. 111-130.
3. Brown D. The State and Ethnic Politics in South-East Asia. London, 1994.
4. Brubaker R. Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the New Europe. – Cambridge, 1996. – 202 p.
5. Bugajski J. Ethnic Politics in Eastern Europe. – Armonk, New York, 1994. – 493 p.
6. Burbach R, Nunez O, Kagarlitsky O. Globalization and its Discontents, The Rise of Postmodern Socialisms. – London, 1997. – 196 p.
7. Carment D., James P. Internal Constraints and Interstate Ethnic Conflict // Journal of Conflict Resolution. March 1995. – Vol.39. # 1. – P. 82-109.
8. Cvetkovich A, Kellner D. Introduction: Thinking Global and Local / Cvetkovich A., Kellner D., eds. Articulating the Global and the Local Globalization and Cultural Studies. – Boulder, 1997. – 258 p.
9. Hale H.E. Statehood at Stake: Democratization, Secession and the Collapse of the USSR. Cambridge, 1998. – 243 p.
10. Hobsbawm E. The nation and globalization // Constellations. 1998. – Vol. 5. # 1. – P. 1-9
11. Horowitz D. Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Berkeley, 1985. – 697 p.
12. Kellas J. The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity. New York, 1991. P. 39-49.
13. Laitin D.D. Identity in Formation: the Russian-speaking populations in the near abroad. – Ithaca, 1998. – 417 p.
14. Meernik J. United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy. Journal of Peace Research. 1996. – Vol. 33. # 4. – P. 391-402.
15. Henkin S. Separatism v Rossii – pozadi ili vpered? // Pro et Contra. 1997. T. 2. № 1. S. 27-43.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Bates R. Ethnic Competition and Modernization in Contemporary Africa Comparative Political Studies. 1974. – Vol. 6. #4. – P. 156-189.
2. Brown C, Boswell T. Ethnic conflict and political violence: A cross-national analysis // Journal of political and military sociology. 1997. – Vol. 25. – # 1. – P. 111-130.
3. Brown D. The State and Ethnic Politics in South-East Asia. London, 1994.
4. Brubaker R. Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the New Europe. – Cambridge, 1996. – 202 p.
5. Bugajski J. Ethnic Politics in Eastern Europe. – Armonk, New York, 1994. – 493 p.

6. Burbach R, Nunez O, Kagarlitsky O. Globalization and its Discontents, The Rise of Postmodern Socialisms. – London, 1997. – 196 p.
7. Carment D., James P. Internal Constraints and Interstate Ethnic Conflict // Journal of Conflict Resolution. March 1995. – Vol.39. # 1. – P. 82-109.
8. Cvetkovich A, Kellner D. Introduction: Thinking Global and Local / Cvetkovich A., Kellner D., eds. Articulating the Global and the Local Globalization and Cultural Studies. – Boulder, 1997. – 258 p.
9. Hale H.E. Statehood at Stake: Democratization, Secession and the Collapse of the USSR. Cambridge, 1998. – 243 p.
10. Hobsbawm E. The nation and globalization // Constellations. 1998. – Vol. 5. # 1. – P. 1-9.
11. Horowitz D. Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Berkeley, 1985. – 697 p.
12. Kellas J. The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity. New York, 1991. P. 39-49.
13. Laitin D.D. Identity in Formation: the Russian-speaking populations in the near abroad. – Ithaca, 1998. – 417 p.
14. Meernik J. United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy. Journal of Peace Research. 1996. – Vol. 33. # 4. – P. 391-402.
15. Хенкин С. Сепаратизм в России – позади или впереди? // Pro et Contra. 1997. Т.2. №1. С. 27-43.

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2020.5.10

УДК 340.116

РОЛЬ ГРОМАДЯНСЬКОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА У ПРОЄКТУВАННІ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ В УКРАЇНІ

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3922-7619>

Чальцева О.М., д. політ. н., завідувач кафедри Донецького національного університету імені Василя Стуса

Процес інституціоналізації громадянського суспільства в Україні як одного з головних акторів публічного поля політики має свої специфічні особливості, які впливають на якість публічного капіталу та стан політичної системи.

Кризові явища в політичній системі України, які призвели до зміни влади, сплеску громадянської активності та появи нових форм взаємодії публічних акторів, актуалізували питання аналізу та моніторингу громадянського сектора в державі та визначення його ролі у формуванні публічної політики.

Процес інституціоналізації громадянського суспільства в українському публічному просторі проходить у тісному взаємозв'язку з державними інститутами, які також структурно і функціонально змінюються, втрачаючи традиційні функції і піддаючись інноваціям. Інституціональні перетворення запускають механізми змін у системі взаємин акторів і формують нові практики співпраці. Складні та фрагментовані взаємодії державних і недержавних інститутів (нових і тих, що реформуються) публічної політики створюють множинність мережових практик співпраці і формують публічний капітал сучасної політичної системи України.

Формування нової моделі публічної політики в Україні по траєкторії «знизу – вгору» (інститутами громадянського суспільства) проходить у відповідності з глобальними тенденціями змін інститутів і практик взаємодій акторів політичних процесів, але має суттєві особливості і труднощі. Унікальність українського варіанту полягає в тому, що громадянське суспільство швидше і результативніше інституціоналізується як публічний актор, ніж держава, яка не «встигає» інституціонально підлаштуватися під зміни і в силу обмеженості традицією попередньої управлінської моделі гальмує участь громадського сектору в політичному житті, створюючи імітаційні практики публічності.

Ключові слова: громадянське суспільство, інститути, публічна політика, капітал, громадський сектор.

Chaltseva O. The role of civil society in the design of public policy in Ukraine

The process of institutionalization of civil society in Ukraine as one of the main actors in the public field of politics has its own specific features that affect the quality of public capital and the state of the political system.

The crises in the political system of Ukraine, which led to a change of government, a surge in civic activity and the emergence of new forms of interaction between public actors, raised the issue of analysis and monitoring of the civil sector in the country and determining its role in public policy.

The process of institutionalization of civil society in the Ukrainian public sphere takes place in close cooperation with state institutions, which are also structurally and functionally changing, losing traditional